

REMARKS:

The claims have been carefully revised taking into account the points raised by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 112, bearing in mind additional inconsistencies in language which have been noted during preparation of this response and in order to further distinguish the invention from the prior art.

Thus Claim 1 is now directed to the combination of the vehicle having a front end loader, as understood by the Examiner in the objection under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claim 1 has been amended to make clear the following features of distinction from the prior art.

- a) The housing is mounted on the mount for the front end loading bucket of the vehicle.
- b) The housing is in the form of an elongate body extending in a longitudinal direction across the front of the vehicle at right angles to the direction of movement of the vehicle.
- c) The housing includes a slide member for sliding movement along the longitudinal direction with an actuator for effecting sliding movement of the slide member such that the cutting mechanism can be moved inwardly and outwardly relative to the vehicle.
- d) The cutting mechanism includes cutting members rotating about a generally vertical axis with a semi-circular cover over the rear part of the cutting mechanism leaving a front part of the cutting

mechanism exposed for cutting standing material as the vehicle moves forwardly over the ground.

It will be noted therefore that Claim 1 now incorporates the features of Claims 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 which are all now cancelled. The Examiner has cited Davison in regard to some of the above claims. The Examiner will note that Davison forms a different type of vehicle in which the arm of the vehicle is mounted for rotational movement about a central hub of the vehicle so that the device is moved side to side of the vehicle by rotation of the cab and the mounting arm. The cutting mechanism appears to be shrouded so that it is intended to cut in a downward direction and it is believed that the cutting mechanism does not include blades which are covered only in the rear section leaving the front part open.

However more importantly Davison does not provide the housing with the longitudinal direction on the slide member which moves along the housing so as to move inwardly and outwardly in the side to side direction of the vehicle. To the contrary, Davison provides an arrangement in which the side to side movement is obtained by rotating the cab.

The intention with Davison is that it appears to have to start at the top of the vegetation and work its way down to do an efficient job. This would not work well to cut vegetation out of fence lines, with which the present invention is primarily concerned. The housing does not allow clearance under the wire in view of its construction rather than the transverse housing of the present arrangement. There would be a sizeable debris field making cleanup time consuming. The machine of the present invention provides a cutter which moves generally horizontally at ground level

allowing for easier cleanup of full length trees. The machine attaches to the front end loader of a generic front end loader vehicle system.

The Examiner has further cited Storm but this provides an arrangement which is mounted on the side of the tractor rather than on the front end loader as defined in Claim 1. Further, the device does not include a housing with a sliding member within the housing which provides the side to side movement. Yet further the device does not provide the shroud as set forth.

This arrangement requires a special adaptor mount which is carried on the tractor. The arrangement of the present invention is mounted on the front end loader as set forth in Claim 1. The arrangement of Storm necessarily includes an outrigger wheel which raises a number of problems. In Storm, the cutter is housed wholly within a housing preventing the cutting of larger trees. In Storm, the location of the cutting device is at one side which is more difficult for the operator to watch. In Storm the complex linkage arrangement providing a number of actuators requires several hydraulic levers to operate the mower device. Removal and insulation of the Storm device is complicated as opposed to the present arrangement which is the conventional front end loader mounting.

The Examiners has further cited Eggena which discloses the mounting of a mower on a skid steer loader at the normal bucket mounting arrangement. However the device does not provide a housing or the side to side sliding member as set forth above. Indeed the Examiner admits he has not cited Eggena in respect of Claim 1.

It is submitted therefore that Claim 1 as now set forth is clearly distinguished from each of the prior art documents cited by the Examiner.

The Examiner has not raised any objections under 35 U.S.C. 103 in regard to Claim 1. In any event, it is submitted that each of the three devices of Eggena, Storm and Davison operate entirely differently utilizing different movements and mounting arrangements. There is no simple combination of these patents therefore which would provide the combination of elements now set forth in Claim 1. Indeed the longitudinal sliding member is not disclosed in any of these three references and therefore cannot be an obvious combination thereof.

It is noted in respect of the sliding member that the Examiner has cited item 16C of Davison. Clearly this does not satisfy the definition now set forth in Claim 1.

New Claim 14 has been added which includes all of the features of Claim 1 set forth above together with the further feature of the push bar 37 shown in the figures and described at page 5 in the paragraph commencing at line 10 and also on page 8 in the paragraph commencing at line 12. None of the prior art documents provides a push bar of the type now set forth in Claim 14. It is submitted therefore that Claim 14 is therefore yet further distinguished from the prior art and should therefore be allowed either with Claim 1 or separately from Claim 1, should Claim 1 be rejected.

Claim 9 has also been carefully amended so as to more clearly point out the present invention and to distinguish the invention from the prior art. Claim 9 now includes many of the features set forth above in respect of Claim 1. However Claim 9 does not include the transverse housing and the slide member. Instead Claim 9 includes the rigid arm which is carried on the vertical plate carried on the mounting of

the skid steer loader vehicle with the rigid arm extending forwardly and outwardly to one side of the ski steer loader. The rigid arm is now defined so that it holds the cutting mechanism in a fixed position relative to the vertical plate such that the position on the ground of the cutting mechanism is controlled by the steering movement of the skid steer loader vehicle.

Yet further the rigid arm is defined such that it extends outwardly to a position outward from one side of the skid steer loader vehicle.

In rejecting original Claim 9, the Examiner has cited Eggena. On this arrangement the mower mounts directly in front of the machine. This means that the vehicle would have to move over recently cut vegetation which may cause a puncture in the tires. In the present invention, as now defined in Claim 9, it is made clear that the cutter device is located to one side of the vehicle at the fixed position carried on the rigid arm.

The Eggena device would therefore would have to approach the fence at a 90 degree angle and bend back away. The design of the present invention with the cutting device arranged to one side of the skid steer loader vehicle allows the vehicle to travel parallel to the fence line and not have to back up. The design of the present invention allows the cutter blades to go along the ground close to the ground and pass under fence wire.

To the contrary in the Eggena device, the housing of the cutter does not allow the machine to cut larger vegetation without lifting the mower high and into the air. This design does not allow for easy vegetation clearing under the existing fence lines.

In addition the vertical movement necessary may cause the device to become tangled in the bottom fence wire.

Further, the present design is arranged to the front and one side of the vehicle which means that the vehicle does not run over fresh cut stumps. Yet further the device allows the cutting arrangement to be close to the ground so that the vegetation is cut to ground level leaving nothing to cause damage.

It is submitted therefore that Claim 9 as amended is clearly distinguished from the arrangement of Eggena. Yet further Eggena does not provide the side fixed mounting arrangement now defined in Claim 9 and does not in any way suggest that such an arrangement should be provided. The present invention is therefore not obvious in view Eggena.

The Examiner has cited Eggena in combination with Davison but only in respect of the shape and arrangement of the cover and has made no mention of the location of the cutting device which is now the feature of Claim 9.

It is submitted therefore that all of the claims are now distinguished from the prior art and should therefore be allowed in view of the above comments.

Additional Claim 13 has been added corresponding to the additional feature of Claim 14 relating to the push bar. Claim 13 is however dependent from Claim 9.

The total number of claims is therefore less than 20 and the total number of independent claims is 3 so that no additional fees are required.

13

In view of the foregoing, further and favourable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted

ALLAN D. ROOKES

PER:

Adrian D. Battison

Registration No: 31,726

ADB/II

October 18, 2004

Enc.(2)

Adrian D. Battison

Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

Telephone (204) 947-1429 - FAX (204) 942-5723

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (703) 872-9306, on October 18, 2004

LYNN LEATHERDALE

Lynn Leatherdale